DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 200 SO 022 185

AUTHOR Murphy, Carol J.; Pescatello, Ann
TITLE Scholars in the Schools: Implementation Handbook.
INSTITUTION California Council for the Humanities, San Francisco.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 87p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Rank (Professional); Educational Change; Educational Objectives; *Humanities Instruction; Intermediate Grades; Liberal Arts; Middle Schools; Professors; *Program Design; *Program Implementation; Secondary Education; Secondary School Curriculum
IDENTIFIERS *California; *Scholars in the Schools Program

ABSTRACT

The Scholars-in-the-Schools program (SIS), previously known as Humanities-in-the-Schools (HIS), is designed to improve humanities education by placing humanities scholars in residence at a middle school or high school. The scholar works with teachers and students as a resource person in a variety of ways: as a curriculum consultant; lecturer; inservice provider; and as a coordinator for special activities such as field trips, film festivals, etc. The scholar's term of residency is dependent on the type of program the school is implementing, but usually involved a part-time commitment for at least a year. This document provides the history and description of the SIS program that was developed by the California Council for the Humanities (CCH), and discusses how a SIS program is implemented. The description of the model SIS program, developed by the CCH focuses on the objectives, key players, project activities, effectiveness of the program, and program costs. Implementation of a SIS program involves a great deal of planning. The major planning phases are the adoption decisions, the planning team, and the orientation seminar. Descriptions of SIS program monitoring and SIS program evaluation also are included. An appendix features sample evaluation instruments. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 339200

Scholars In The Schools

IMPLEMENTATION HANDBOOK

SO 022 185

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
ANNE M. PESCATELLO
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HUMANITIES **CALIFORNIA COUNCIL FOR THE HUMANITIES**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SCHOLARS-IN-THE-SCHOOLS

IMPLEMENTATION HANDBOOK

Carol J. Murphy

and

Ann Pescatello

California Council for the Humanities
312 Sutter St., Suite 601
San Francisco, CA 94108

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The conception, development, and implementation of a program such as the Scholars-in-the-Schools is never a singular effort, particularly when it is so successful. Even though this program began nearly a decade ago, time has not dimmed my memory of all who were involved in its life.

When Bruce Sievers, then Executive Director of the California Council for the Humanities (in Public Policy, was its surname then) asked me to take on the task of initiating a pilot program that placed humanities scholars in K-12 schools, I readily accepted the challenge, not simply because I believed in the concept but because he believed in it too. Without his strong support of the program in all its public aspects and his complete endorsement of the program to the Council, year after year, the program could never have gone beyond the initial six months.

The pilot program that became the model for all succeeding programs in the pilot phase of SIS was the San Mateo Union High School District's Humanists-in-the-Schools. The joy of trial-and-error as we gave birth to a solid SIS program was a unique experience which I shared with Renée Golanty-Koel, the district liaison who enthusiastically brought together Aldo Pardini, Fred Holmes, Elvira Schwartz, and Herschel Hirshberg, stellar teachers all, with the scholars who set the high standards for all who followed--Satendra Khanna and Beverly Allen, the two initial scholars (along with me during the first term). The major credit for transporting this northern California model to southern California belongs to Audrey Welch of the Glendale Unified School District.

Although there are many members of the California Council for the Humanities whom I should single out for exceptional support of the program were there time and space, there are two without whose help in so many aspects the program would not have succeeded so splendidly. John Connell, President of the Michael Connell Foundation, had the idea for a resident scholar in the schools and during his term on the Council vigorously pushed that idea and was the catalyst for SIS in southern California. William Marcussen (Marc to his friends), then President of the Atlantic Richfield Foundation and Vice President of Atlantic Richfield, was an unwavering patron saint of the idea and of all the projects in the program.

Members of the CCH staff through time have been enormously helpful in the nitty gritty aspects of the program and include present and former staffers such as Phyllis Quan, Raquel Scherr-Salgado, Katherine Kobayashi, Teri Peterson, Pamela Lynch, Michael Lewis, and Cait Croughan. In particular I would like to single out Christina Herrick, who patiently and accurately supervised the fiscal operations of the program; Jim Quay, who since succeeding Bruce Sievers as Executive Director of the CCH, has been a thoughtful and creative endorser of SIS; and Dorothy Reed, who as editor and the CCH public relations officer for most of the life of SIS was its unstinting champion and proselytizer for quality humanities education.

I wish I could thank publicly in print all of the participants in all of the SIS projects here in California, all of the members of the California Council for the Humanities, and our colleagues in the State Programs division of the National Endowment for the Humanities. Please know here that your support and efforts have been greatly appreciated.

Ann Pescatello
Project Director

1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Scholars-in-the-Schools: The CCH Model 4

A. History of the CCH Model 4

B. Description of the Model 10

1. Objectives 11
2. Key Players 11
3. Project Activities 18
4. Effectiveness of the Program 21
5. Program Costs 25

Implementation of an SIS Program 27

A. SIS Program Planning 27

1. Adoption Decisions 28
2. The Planning Team 31
3. The Orientation Seminar 47

B. SIS Program Monitoring 49

C. SIS Program Evaluation 50

Appendix: Sample Evaluation Instruments

INTRODUCTION

Scholars-in-the-Schools (SIS)* is a program that places a humanities scholar in residence at a middle school or high school. The scholar works with teachers and students as a resource person in a variety of ways: as a curriculum consultant; lecturer; inservice provider; and as a coordinator for special activities such as field trips, film festivals, student projects, etc. The scholar's term of residency is dependent on the type of program the school is implementing, but usually involves a part-time commitment for at least a year.

The purpose of the program is to strengthen the humanities disciplines in the schools. The humanities disciplines as defined by the Congress include: history, philosophy, language, linguistics, literature, archaeology, jurisprudence, history and criticism of the arts, ethics, comparative religion and those aspects of the social sciences employing historical or philosophical approaches--cultural anthropology, sociology, political theory, international relations, and other subjects concerned with values and non-quantitative matters.

For eight years, from 1978-1986, the California Council for the Humanities (CCH) supported pilot projects of the SIS model at twelve California school districts. Students and faculty at 26 schools--1 K-8, 7 middle or junior high schools, and 18 high schools--were involved in the SIS program. This Handbook will describe the SIS model as it was developed by the CCH including some of the adaptations and specific activities used at the SIS sites.

*SIS replaces the previous name of the program, HIS, or Humanists-in-the-Schools.

The intended audience of this Handbook is those who are concerned with humanities education and who might be interested in adopting the SIS model. The purpose of the Handbook is to assist those educators to make their implementation decision based on the experiences of previous users of the model. The basic structure of the SIS program will be described in terms of the key players, events and costs involved. The specifics of planning, monitoring, and evaluating a program will then be discussed. Recommendations for successful implementation that were offered by both the participants and the evaluators of the CCH project will be included.

The SIS program as outlined here has a basic structure, but each of the components is flexible and can be adjusted to the specific needs of a site as can readily be seen in the brief case descriptions of the twelve pilot sites.* The purpose of the program is a broad one--to strengthen the humanities in the schools and to remind the out-of-school public of the crucial role of the humanities in American society--and the means of implementing it can be as varied as the number of sites involved. SIS has been implemented at urban, suburban, and rural sites with a variety of student populations in grades 6-12. On the whole, as the program evaluation indicates, SIS was successful in introducing new resources, methods and ideas relative to humanities education into the public school curriculum.

*contained in a separate publication, "Scholars-in-the-Schools Project Site Reports"

PROFILE OF A SCHOLARS-IN-THE-SCHOOLS PROGRAM

WHAT IS IT?	A humanities scholar works with school or district staff to plan and carry out learning activities related to the humanities curriculum
WHO IS IT FOR?	Students in humanities courses in grades 6-12
HOW IS THE PROGRAM IMPLEMENTED?	The program is implemented either districtwide or by individual school; it is integrated into existing curricula with some special events or projects that can be schoolwide but which are a planned component of the program
WHAT ARE SOME TYPES OF PROGRAM ACTIVITIES?	Classroom presentations by scholars; independent study; teacher inservice; field trips; special events such as film festivals or cultural fairs
WHO RUNS THE PROGRAM?	The project coordinator can be the principal or other school administrator; a district administrator; a teacher; a counselor; a special project coordinator such as an early retiree or volunteer
WHO NEEDS TO BE INVOLVED?	The project team consists of a project coordinator; one or more teachers of humanities subjects; a district or school administrative advisor; one or more humanities scholars; non-staff resource people for special events or program planning; volunteers to help coordinate activities, raise funds or line up community support
WHAT STAFF TRAINING IS NEEDED?	Planning workshops; consultation with other SIS users
WHAT DOES IT COST?	The average cost is $10,000 per year per school. This includes scholar's time, teacher compensation, materials, and field trip transportation
WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS?	• students and teachers have contact with university scholars in the humanities • teachers feel the program "re-vitalizes" the humanities curriculum • teacher professionalism and self-esteem is enhanced • students take part in field trips and special events they may not otherwise experience • opportunities are offered for parent/community participation in school activities

SCHOLARS-IN-THE-SCHOOLS: THE CCH MODEL

History of the CCH Model

In 1978 the CCH decided to sponsor its first program in humanities education for a school-age population. CCH projects usually serve an out-of-school adult public; however, a number of conditions in education and society in the late 1970s prompted the CCH to fund the first experimental SIS project. At that time California's public school funds were severely cut back due to Proposition 13, the Serrano-Priest decision and declining enrollments.

The Council had several goals. It saw the SIS program as a means to counter the tendency to cut back on humanities programs in the schools. It also viewed SIS as a means of enhancing awareness and appreciation of the humanities in the community as a whole. And the CCH wished to establish ties between schools and universities by placing scholars in the schools.

The Council knew that this experimental undertaking had not been tried before. Seeking a model for such a program, the Council commissioned a national survey of humanities education programs and found that no school district had tried placing people with advanced degrees in the humanities in K-12 classrooms for periods as long as a semester or two. Such programs as existed were limited, using guest lecturers from universities for single presentations or brief periods of instruction. The CCH, therfore, launched its program as an ongoing experiment that would define itself as it went along. It also stipulated that the program be designed and carried out to serve the mainstream student body, not just the gifted or college-bound students.

The Council proposed a three-year commitment, annually renewable, to interested districts. Each district raised private cash contributions, usually from the local foundations, which the CCH matched at 85% with funds from the National Endowment for the Humanities. By placing a scholar from the humanities in residence for at least two days a week, over a period of up to three school years at a site, and by having that scholar work with a team of co-teachers from various departments at the high school, the CCH felt that a recognizable contribution could be made to teachers, students, and curriculum alike.

Dr. Ann Pescatello of the University of California, Berkeley, developed the initial pilot program which was tested in 1978-79 in the San Mateo Union High School District, twenty miles south of San Francisco. The present form of the SIS model came from the trial-and-error of this successful pilot. In the next eight years, SIS projects were in operation in twelve districts (26 school sites) located in eight counties across the state. Both individual schools and entire districts implemented the program, which proceeded in three phases as illustrated in Table 1.

The primary criteria for selecting the initial pilot sites were evidence that: (1) teachers would be committed and involved, (2) preliminary planning had been done to define project goals and methods, and (3) the school or district could get financial sponsorship from a local funding agency. The third criterion, a local match of grant funds, most often determined which districts received the SIS grants.

Upon completion of the initial pilot phase in 1980, the Council felt it had a viable model program, and indeed SIS was cited in "The Humanities in American Life," the 1980 report of the Commission on the Humanities,

Table 1.
The Three Implementation Phases of SIS Projects

Phase	Sites	Yrs. of Operation
Pilot:	San Mateo Union High School	9/78-6/81
9/78-6/80	Glendale Unified School District	9/79-6/82
Expansion:	Los Angeles Unified School District	9/80-9/82
9/80-6/83	Acalanes High School, Lafayette	9/82-6/83
	Benjamin Franklin Middle School, S.F.	9/82-6/85
	Jefferson Union High School, Daly City	9/82-6/85
Final projects:	Berkeley Arts Magnet School	9/83-6/85
9/83-6/86	Amador Valley Joint High School District, Pleasanton	9/83-6/86
	Hall Middle School, Larkspur	9/83-6/86
	Pleasanton Unified School District	9/83-6/86
	Sierra-Plumas Joint Unified School District, Loyalton and Downieville	9/83-6/86
	Valhalla High School, El Cajon	9/83-6/86

sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation, as a model that has "made considerable progress in improving the humanities in the schools."

Between 1980 and 1982 the program expanded to four more sites, including the project's first middle school site in San Francisco. The realities of finding matching funding sources and accessible scholars meant that many sites were in moderately affluent areas close to urban areas and educational centers.

The final program awards were made to six sites in 1983 with the intention that these would be the last of the demonstration project sites. Among this group of six was the only rural project, that of the Sierra-Plumas Joint Unified School District.

Table 2 summarizes the key features of the twelve SIS pilot sites.

Table 2.
Key Features of Twelve SIS Project Sites

Project Site	Location	# Sites	# Students	Annual Funding	Scholar Disciplines
San Mateo Union High School Dist	suburban San Francisco	3 HS	1200-1900	$25,500	literature; film;economics; music;history; French
Glendale Unified School District	greater Los Angeles	3 HS; 4 JH	900-2000	$27,500	French; poetry; art hist;film; anthropology
Los Angeles Unified School District	urban and suburban Los Angeles	3 HS	3100-3600	$67,500	literature; African hist; French
Acalanes High Schl	suburban San Francisco	1 HS	1400	$14,800	music;history; Asian studies
Benjamin Franklin Middle School	urban	1 MS	850	$ 9,500	French literature;Asian studies
Jefferson Union High Schl Dist	suburban San Francisco	4 HS	1000-1600	$25,000	French, English, German literature; music
Berkeley Arts Magnet	urban	K-8	210	$17,000	history;comparative literature
Foothill High School	semi-rural	1 HS	1460	$18,000	history;German
Hall Middle School	suburban San Francisco	1 MS	300	$ 8,500	history;religion
Harvest Park Intermediate Schl	suburban San Francisco	1 Int. (7-8)	1088	$15,500	history;comparative literature
Sierra-Plumas Joint Unified Schl Dist	rural	2 HS (7-12)	85-142	$12,000	history
Valhalla High School	suburban San Diego	1 HS	1800	$ 8,500	history

Table 2.
Key Features of Twelve SIS Project Sites

# scholars	Types of Activities	Ideas
6	"passports" for field trips; field experience packets; film festival; oral history projects	use of semi-retired teachers; independent study courses
11	field trips; walking tours; lectures; local history booklet; "museum bags"; oral history projects; individual projects	two-day teacher workshops at end of first year
3	field trips including trips to other SIS schools; lectures; faculty inservice; independent study projects; videotape	structured inservice program for school staff; inter-school visits by students
3	lectures; cultural special events	funding & volunteer support from non-profit foundation
2	field trips; film festival; history fairs	teacher inservice on group process; handbook of curriculum materials
4	field trips; film festival; evening mtg at parents' homes; poets-in-the-schools; pull-out program	early-retirement project coordinator; scholar dialog w/ parents; served "special needs" population
3	storytelling; guest lecture; field trip	scholar planned w/teachers on a weekly basis
2	guest lectures; women's culture week; small group seminars; local history videotape; language night	coordinator has 1 release period; worked w/local tv station
1	lectures; simulation games; bibliographies; resource guide in myths	gifted students took university courses
2	lectures; history resource center; individual projects; field trips	inservice workshops for history faculty
1	lectures; field trips; exhibits; exchange visits w/minority students from urban areas	emphasis on student-produced papers, oral histories, displays
2	lectures; field trips; special events; debates; student-written plays	field trips on Saturdays; student advisory group helps select activities; parent forums

Description of the Model

Perhaps the most helpful way to describe the CCH model of the SIS program is by responding to some of the potential adopter's questions such as:

- How can the SIS program benefit the district?
- Who needs to be involved in the program planning and operation?
- What are the costs in terms of teacher time, funds, other resources?
- How does it get started?
- Will it really work?

This section will outline the CCH model in terms of its objectives, the key players, sample project activities, evidence of effectiveness, and the cost of implementation.

This description is intended to serve as an illustration of an educational program that works. The features of the CCH model are not intended to be prescriptive elements of an SIS program, but rather to be suggested parameters for establishing similar programs in a variety of different public and private school sites. It will become obvious in the sections on planning, monitoring and evaluating a program as well as in the case study descriptions of the twelve pilot sites that **each** of the above-mentioned program components not only **can be** but **needs to be** adapted to suit the specific needs and resources of a district or school.

Objectives

The CCH intended that the SIS program would accomplish several objectives:

1. encourage an understanding of the value and meaning of humanities for high school students who may or may not proceed to college
2. stimulate scholars trained in core disciplines of the humanities to make challenging presentations of their disciplines in practical teaching situations
3. provide an environment for a fruitful interchange between scholars with special expertise in disciplines of the humanities and high school teachers and administrators
4. explore ways to develop innovative and experimental humanities curricula for high schools
5. encourage joint funding of humanities education projects with other foundations

Based on program evaluation data, the SIS project did indeed attain a high degree of success in all of the above. The objectives of the individual projects varied according to specific site requirements and resources. However, most all included statements similar to objectives #1, #3 and #4 listed above.

Key Players

Several different configurations of key players were successfully used by the projects. The role of project coordinator was filled by people with a variety of subject matter and administrative backgrounds: teachers, principals, counselors, early retirees, or volunteers. Teachers worked individually or in teams--either departmentally or across disciplines. Scholars usually worked for one year with a school or district; but some

stayed for three years and some less than six months. Their roles varied: some were guest lecturers in the classrooms, some planned and conducted extensive teacher inservice programs, some wrote curriculum materials or conducted special student projects.

Regardless of the specifics of each person's role, however, it was clear that a team effort is needed to make the program work. Overall administrative support is also an essential ingredient for success. A brief overview of the roles of teachers, scholars, coordinators and school administrators, and students is included here.

Teachers. The most successful projects are those which have widest teacher support. In many cases, scholars depend on teachers for invitations to work in classrooms with students and also depend on them to integrate their presentations into the curriculum. The greatest barrier to successful implementation of an SIS program is the reluctance or refusal by teachers to work with the scholar. While the SIS project was never responsible for creating fresh conflict among staff, it was sometimes viewed as adding to existing problems related to teaching style, philosophy, tenure and workload. Using the project as a bridge for already-existing differences across or within departments is not a realistic goal.

The most successful projects all used some definite means of project planning with both teachers and scholars present. These meetings, usually a full day or even two days, were important in establishing a cooperative working environment for the participating teachers and scholars. This was important since many of the teachers involved with the project contributed substantial extra time during the year for planning among themselves and with the scholar. Some schools and districts arranged for the extra time

by providing occasional substitutes or a regular period of release time or extra pay for summer, weekend, or after-hour meetings.

Most projects were designed to be interdisciplinary with a core group of three or four teachers representing some combination of the English, history, social studies, foreign language and art departments. In some cases the main interaction by the scholar was with only these core teachers, with some arrangements made for guest lectures in other classrooms or school-wide invitations to special project events. To insure against the scholar's time being monopolized by just a few of the most enthusiastic teachers, the projects experimented with a variety of schedules for rotating scholar assignments among departmental areas and school sites. For example, a district with multiple school sites and scholars tried a formal rotation schedule of scholar-teacher pairings in the first year; voluntary teacher-selection of scholars in the second; and reassignment of scholars to different schools in the third. One single-site project assigned scholars to work predominately with different departmental areas each year.

Avoid introducing scholars to teachers during their pre-school-year planning days--a time when teachers are concerned about setting up their classrooms and getting their course assignments. It is important to set aside some time for scholars and teachers to get to know each other without having to rely on lunch time or "free" periods. The sooner the scholar gets into the classroom the more effective he or she can be.

Scholars. The typical SIS scholar has two or three strong academic interests in the humanities, has completed a doctoral program or is a doctoral candidate needing only to submit a dissertation. Both the project coordinators and the scholars in the CCH projects felt that the full three

years of the project were needed to successfully implement the program. During the first year, scholars learn the school culture, what the major needs are, which teachers are receptive and which approaches hold most promise. In the second year scholars can develop their ideas more completely and work more effectively with teachers. The third year gives scholars an opportunity to solidify their accomplishments by making sure that teachers can conduct the learning activities without the scholar being present.

One scholar whose residency was only three months long felt that although her accomplishments were of high quality, it had taken her a good part of the residency to get to know the school. The advice of scholars placed in these "mini-residencies" was that they should be given an orientation to prepare them to work in the schools and should not be given the responsibility for initiating program events with teachers.

In addition to their own participation at the schools, scholars often arranged for visits by their colleagues either to give classroom presentations or to hold seminars with teachers. Scholars were also often willing to make informal presentations to PTA's, parent or community groups or other schools.

The scholar's contributions can be made a lasting part of the curriculum resources available to teachers by recording--on audio or video tape--their presentations or by placing the lectures on file. Materials developed by a scholar for a particular school site are often much more valuable than units developed at other schools. The scholar can also provide a list of community contacts or bibliographic resources that will be useful for future class projects or teaching units.

Coordinators and School Administrators. CCH project coordinators included school principals, teachers, counselors, and special program coordinators--some of whom were retired educators or volunteers. Five of the single-site projects began with principals as coordinators, but only one of the projects completed all three years with a principal as coordinator. Three of the principals moved to other jobs and one had only a one-year project. One of the benefits of having principals as coordinators is that they can add the coordination to their other duties. Teacher coordinators need release time from their classes, which is difficult for many schools and districts to arrange.

Only one project, the rural two-school project, began with a teacher as coordinator. However, at five other project sites--both single-site and multi-site--teachers took over the coordination functions in the second or third year. There are some trade-offs to consider in assigning the coordinator role to either a teacher or a principal. While it is very important for teachers at the site(s) to feel ownership of the program, a teacher-coordinator sometimes may keep the program activities limited to one discipline whereas the principals and district administrators are usually very interested in encouraging the broadest possible use of the program and the scholars.

At multi-site projects, district-level administrative support is critical. Not all site principals within a district will be equally committed to the project, but they will cooperate when they know that the project is a district priority with the strong support of an assistant superintendent.

Although some projects operated successfully despite less than enthusiastic support from a principal, the positive support and leadership of a principal was a clear benefit, both in expediting implementation and in securing broader faculty participation, particularly in the beginning year.

Four of the multi-site projects began with a district-level coordinator. These projects usually had one of the teachers at each school site as a lead teacher. This lead teacher was the scholar's main contact person at the site.

One of the primary functions of the project coordinator, or in some cases the lead teacher, is to be the main liaison for the scholars, helping them understand the school climate and administrative procedures, defining the parameters of the scholars' activities and schedules, and encouraging and supporting the scholars in their attempts to reach teachers who may be less receptive than others. The coordinator is also usually the main advocate and spokesperson for the project at the school(s) and often disseminates publicity about major project activities to the local media and the community.

Students. Students were exposed to and participated in SIS projects at a variety of levels. At the broadest level, school-wide student populations were reached through performances, presentations, and project publications. Most of the projects sponsored a humanities-related event or activity that was open to or involved the whole school. These activities ranged from a performance by a Shakespeare troupe to full-day ethnic festivals organized by students, teachers, and SIS scholars.

In the first example, students clearly enjoyed the performance, but it was a passive experience for them and only one teacher used her expertise

to augment the performance. For the hundreds of other students who attended the performance there was no other connection to the SIS scholar. In the second example, the scholar worked over the course of a semester with an interdisciplinary planning committee of four teachers. Several classes were actively engaged with the scholar and teachers over several weeks studying about cultures and preparing their own presentations, costumes, decorations, etc. The whole school and community were invited to attend festival events.

The most frequent type of interaction between scholars and students will be in the classroom. During the course of the year, scholars will give guest lectures to individual classrooms on topics usually selected or requested by the teacher and sometimes jointly planned by the teacher and scholar. Typically the scholar will work with only three to five class sections in which he or she will make four or more presentations in the semester. They may also make a single presentation in four to twelve other classrooms during the year. Since scholars are generally dependent on teacher invitations to work with a given class, there is seldom any systematic effort to work with all students in a given subject area, the same students across different subject areas, or the same students across the three year period.

Several of the CCH projects encouraged selected students to work individually with scholars on independent research or study projects. A number of the scholars indicated that they would have enjoyed more opportunities to work directly with individual students, but that there was little or no flexibility in school schedules and course structures that permitted such interaction, especially with students from regular (i.e.,

not gifted) classes and those at departmentalized junior high schools. Most of the coordinators and teachers felt that such individual work with students would be desirable but was not cost-effective given the limited number of scholars and the limited amount of time they had available.

Project Activities

Individual sites are invited to explore a wide variety of project activities. Even at multi-school projects, scholars and teachers can be fairly autonomous in structuring a wide variety of activities. Indeed in some cases the problem is one of undertaking either too many or too complex activities.

The main types of SIS activities are outlined in Table 3. A more detailed listing of specific activities is available in the Planning section of the Handbook.

Table 3. Major Types of Project Activities

Activity	Examples	Comments
In-class Lesson by Scholars	Integrated with lessons	*Usually involved 1 or more units *Involved teacher co-planning and participation *Content more likely to be incorporated later by teacher
	Enrichment or drop-in lessons	*Usually one-shot presentation *Ancillary to instruction *From scholar's repertoire or developed on topic at request *Little to no co-planning and follow-up by teacher
Independent Study	by Students	*Occasional independent research conducted by individual students under scholar supervision; *Involved a range of students
Activities for Teachers	Informal meetings and discussions	*Informal discussions in faculty lounges at breaks and lunch were most common methods *Some projects hosted socials for introducing scholars to teachers
	Planning meetings	*Usually only involved 1-4 core project teachers and scholar
	Inservices	*Infrequent; one scholar arranged for university staff to conduct a workshop
	Seminars	*Rare, but one scholar arranged a series of guest lectures on academic topics for teachers
Field Trips	Into community or ethnic neighborhoods	*Often walking tours *At urban sites, related to students' nearby environment *At suburban sites, trips to cities to experience "new" cultures

Table 3. Major Types of Project Activities (Continued)

Activity	Examples	Comments
Field Trips (con't.)	To cultural resources/ museums: art, history & cultural; and to attend cultural & artistic events	*Most successful trips were integrated into classes, with class time given to scholar to prepare students and follow-up *Included a variety of special and scheduled events with a humanities focus *Grant funds were required *Family members sometimes went
	To resource centers: libraries, archives, & university campuses	*Less frequent, more academically oriented
Special Events	Interdisciplinary/ interdepartmental	*Frequently organized through core teachers as representatives of the departments; *Included fairs, festivals, special projects intermixing language, cultural, and historical aspects
	School-wide	*Usually organized/hosted by several classes with help from teachers and scholar, rest of school invited to view or attend *Sometimes used outside artists, dramatists, guest lectures
	Multi-school	*Reciprocal invitations to tour school campuses, attend events as above
	Community	*Includes invitations to festivals and field trips; one scholar organized series of film festivals with parent and community discussions
Topical Research	by Scholar	*Research beyond what scholar typically did to prepare own lessons - several scholars prepared background papers for teachers' use, compiled bibliographies, annotated school library holdings, prepared slide collections, etc.

Effectiveness of the Program

The SIS program represents a major experimental effort by an external agency to introduce new resources, methods, and ideas into the public school curriculum. The program was initiated in 1987, at a time when California's historically high support for education had eroded, yet SIS persisted and grew despite the years of substantial reductions in school funding, declining enrollment, low teacher morale, and strong emphasis on teaching and testing the "basics."

The program evaluators reviewed project reports, materials, and program files, conducted personal interviews with participants and constituents, and made site visits to all twelve projects. Their data support the following conclusions about the SIS program and its impact on the participating individuals and institutions.

STUDENTS

- SIS projects successfully served a broad mix of students at each site, i.e., in terms of their ethnicity, gender, academic ability, and degree of interest in college.
- Field trips, special events and presentations exposed students to museums, cultures, and activities that they otherwise would not have experienced during their school years or probably even as adults.
- Scholars were most effective with students in grades 7-12. Work with students from lower grades generally did not utilize the special talents of the scholar.

SCHOLARS

- The selection process of scholars was generally successful, resulting in the identification of talented, innovative, and committed scholars who were able to work effectively with pre-college students.
- In order to maximize the full potential of the scholar's contribution, teachers need adequate preparation and planning time to work cooperatively with the scholars.

TEACHERS	• Participating teachers, even those with only minimal involvement, generally acknowledged the re-vitalizing aspects of the scholar's activities.
	• Participation of teachers was generally voluntary and therefore seldom involved the entire faculties within departments. At most schools there was a small core of three to five interested faculty who utilized the scholar on a regular basis.
ADMINISTRATORS	• Administrators strongly valued the enhanced prestige the SIS program brought to their schools. It was useful in motivating students and also appealed to parents.
	• Active support from principals was helpful, but the frequent turnover among principals needs to be taken into account.
COMMUNITY	• Broad community involvement may be desirable, but due to the considerable time needed to organize and promote community activities, it is not the most efficient allocation of a scholar's limited time.
SCHOOLS	• The lasting impact at the school level depends on a core of key teachers with administrative support. The loss of a key administrator or teachers through transfers or retirement generally signaled a major reduction in the activities.
	• Activities were often extended to other schools within the participating district and even to feeder school districts. The activities were generally successful as one-shot events, but it proved difficult to extend or establish a full range of residentcy activities at other sites.

In addition to the generally postive findings outlined above, the evaluators made several recommendations they felt would further strengthen the operation of an SIS program. The points listed in Table 4 are also included in the planning, monitoring and evaluating activites described in the second section of this Handbook.

Table 4. Recommendations for Future SIS Programs

WIDER SOURCES FOR SCHOLARS	1. Consider other sources of scholars besides those who are working on their doctorates or who have just completed doctorates. Other possibilities include university faculty who have retired or other tenured faculty with reduced university workloads; scholars affiliated with other institutions such as museums, archives, libraries, etc.; independent and professional scholars who work in a variety of business and government positions.
PRE-PROJECT WORKSHOPS	2. Require scholars to attend a pre-residency workshop where experienced scholars and coordinators can illustrate sample lessons and activities, discuss ways to secure teacher and administrative support and interest, etc.
MID-YEAR EXCHANGES OF IDEAS	3. Provide regular opportunities for scholars and coordinators from various sites to interact and exchange ideas and experiences during the course of the projects.
SCHOLAR VISIBILITY ON-SITE	4. Scholars should have a visible, accessible work space, and be available informally during breaks and lunch and at other arranged times before or after school.
PRE-PLANNING WITH TEACHERS	5. Substantial planning time for all participating teachers and scholars should be allocated each summer before school begins. If possible scholars should even collaborate with teachers and plan project activities prior to grant awards. Planning grants might be awarded and final approval of a project's proposal would depend on evidence that a substantial core group of teachers have been involved and that a wide cross-section of other teachers are knowledgeable about the proposal and support it.
SUPPORT FOR TEACHERS	6. Primary emphasis should be placed on how scholars can collaborate with teachers, enhance teachers' effectiveness in the classroom, and support the integration of the scholars' information into the lessons.

Table 4. Recommendations for Future SIS Programs (Continued)

TEACHER RELEASE TIME	7. Teachers need adequate release time during the school year for planning with scholars. It is not reasonable to expect that adequate integration of the scholar's work into the teacher's lessons can be accomplished solely during teacher breaks and lunch.
FOCUSED ACTIVITIES	8. Scholars and coordinators should focus on a limited set of selected activities, especially in the first year.
EXTENSIVE COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT UNREALISTIC	9. Attempts to involve community members in school-based activities are difficult for most schools. Such efforts generally are not the most productive use of a scholar's time and effort.
REVISE EVALUATION	10. Simplify and standardize the forms used for ongoing project evaluation.

Program Costs

The average cost to implement the SIS program has been about $10,000 per year per school site. This amount pays the scholar's stipend and provides tickets, transportation and curriculum materials for out-of-school events. The cost of the scholar's stipend can be reduced by using emeritus faculty or by making an arrangement with a university to have scholars donate some of their time.

A breakdown of the $10,000 cost would include:

personnel scholars were budgeted at $75 to $90/day (substitute rate)	6,000
teacher training includes substitutes for teachers on release time and compensation for meetings on weekends or in summer	1,000
reference materials	1,000
field trips tickets, transportation	2,000

Budget planning may also need to include honoraria for resource specialists or staff development of planning consultants.

The CCH pilot projects were awarded grants for the program but were expected to match these funds with other cash donations and "in-kind" contributions from their district or community. In-kind support includes staff time, space and equipment use, and other materials and services.

If funding for the SIS program to be implemented will need to rely on "outside" sources such as private, corporate or community foundations or

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

local businesses or community groups, fund-raising strategies should be determined early on in the project planning. Fundraising is a specialized skill that needs to be undertaken by a person or a group familiar with this particular task. Sometimes a district office administrator has this kind of experience and in some cases a parent or community group will be interested in launching a grass-roots campaign.

It is important that there be a realistic budget for the program and that the fund-raising strategies be agreed on so the planning team can focus on the tasks related to scholar selection, teacher training and project activities without being sidetracked by fundraising concerns.

IMPLEMENTATION OF AN SIS PROGRAM

SIS Program Planning

The most successful SIS projects were those that were the most carefully planned and able to capitalize on the initial enthusiasm of participants and sponsors. This section will offer an overview of the entire planning process.

The planning discussion will be divided into three sections: (1) adoption decisions to be made; (2) planning team roles; and (3) orientation seminar for participants.

This program planning outline is a more or less sequentially arranged overview of the decisions that will determine whether or not it is feasible for the school/district to adopt the SIS model and if so, the actions that will help prepare for its implementation. Potential users of the SIS model are urged to read the twelve SIS program profiles in the companion publication, "Scholars-in-the-Schools Project Site Reports." They offer some specific examples of implementation problems and innovative resolutions discovered by the pilot project sites. This Handbook is intended only as a guide to some of the general strategies for implementation of the SIS program. It may be that an adoption decision for your school or district can best be made after consulting with the program coordinator of a pilot project whose demographics or needs closely resemble your own.

Adoption Decisions

a. Needs Assessment

What do you want this program to do for you? Discuss your school/ district's problem areas or specific needs that could be met by this program.

(1) Make a "wish list," that is, a list of "what we would like to see in our curriculum," Include:

- ideals, e.g., liberal education; exposure to "humanities alive"; making curriculum more experiential
- student outcomes, e.g., test scores, college prep, relationship to humanities
- teacher concerns, e.g., curriculum; professionalism; working together
- curriculum improvements, e.g., interdepartmental; use of outside resources
- administrative concerns, e.g., prestige; community involvement; means of pulling the staff together; targeting minorities or special populations for enrichment

(2) Make a "Problems list" or a "what exists now that we would like to change" list in terms of the above categories.

(3) Compare the two profiles.

b. Goals and Objectives

Translate the above-listed anticipated outcomes or benefits into:

(1) a broad goal statement suitable for describing the overall aim of the program

(2) specific objectives that can be used to map out a strategy of who needs to be involved and what needs to be done

c. Priorities, Limitations and Realities

Focus on the objectives that need to be addressed **now** and also the ones that most realistically **can** be addressed by this program. Narrow the list down in terms of subject matter, number of schools, number of teachers, scholars or activities so that it fits into the reality of your situation:

--the staff time you have available

--the money you have or could raise

--the attitudes and present working relationships among staff and adminstrators

--the student population and current curriculum priorities

This focusing process means taking the objectives you have outlined and thinking them through in terms of your key players and your resources:

Key players: Who would need to be involved?

Will they be supportive of the program or need to be convinced?

How well will they work with the other team members?

How much preparation will they need?

Resources: Is there money in the budget now for teacher release time, substitutes, inservice training?

Is there special program or consultant money in the budget for scholars or planning consultants?

Are scholars readily available to the site?

What other resources will be needed--facilities, materials, transportation, etc.?

Will fundraising need to be done? What kind--grant writing to foundations, a community "grass roots" campaign, a district administrator's appeal to local organizations?

Who can handle the fundraising responsibility?

It is important at this stage not to be overly ambitious. If resources get stretched too thin and key players start having to put in more time than anticipated or their own money for transportation or resources, their enthusiasm for the project will quickly erode.

It is also important not to underestimate any of the "personal factors" involved: the current relationships between teachers and administrators, teachers and department heads, etc. A total buy-in by all staff is not needed, but a firm commitment by a core of people that will form the project team is needed.

REMINDER:

- Teachers need to be enthusiastic about possibilities for innovation in the curriculum **and** in their classroom.
- Administrators need to be at least receptive to the program since they are the key to many of the services, facilities, and resources the project will require.
- Scholars need to be scholars in a recognized discipline of the humanities. The keystone of the program is the scholar's insights and experiences in the subject matter of the humanities.
- Parents and community members should indicate some interest in the program.

It might be an interesting exercise for your group to rate each of the above four factors on a "support scale" of 1-10 and see if your program will be off to a strong start.

d. A Project Description

Based on the results of the above deliberations, write a four-page project description that includes:

(1) project goal(s)--an overall statement with one or two primary objectives

(2) key participants--a list of who will make the project work either by title or name with a brief description of their anticipated role

(3) anticipated cost--a broad estimate for personnel, materials and transportation

(4) sample activities--an outline of some suggested activities for the humanities curriculum

(5) project timeline--a list of the schedule of events for one year

(6) "next steps"--what needs to be done immediately to further the implementation process

e. Yes or No

Based on both the **process** and the **product** of the above preliminary planning meetings, a decision can be made on whether or not to continue the planning process and assemble a planning team to map out the specifics of curriculum planning, scholar selection, teacher preparation and program evaluation.

The Planning Team

The members of the planning team will differ from site to site depending on the scope of the anticipated project, its location, duration and other factors. These guidelines do not specify who the planners should be nor

what the agendas for their meetings should be. There are, however, certain points to keep in mind relative to overall strategy that may be applicable to almost all programs.

a. Curriculum Planning

Teacher teams which ideally include at least one member from English literature, social studies, foreign languages and one or more science, math or fine arts teachers, meet to discuss "what is" and "what could be" in terms of humanities content in the curriculum.

This will probably be a very tricky discussion since it involves departmental and teachers' turf. It might be a good strategy to agree on some broad curricular objectives first and when the specifics of logistics or responsibilities begin to split the group into factions, refer again to the agreed-upon objectives, trying to find a new point of departure for planning the activities.

Although it is important for this group to have a sense of "ownership" of the planned activities, it might be useful to look at some of the activities conducted at the pilot sites. It is important that the first meetings are more or less "idea" meetings. They can go no further until the scholar-in-residence is selected and meets with the teachers. He or she can also provide input to suggested activities and perhaps give some sample lessons.

b. Suggested Activities

(1) Scholar Presentations

In-class presentations were the most common format that scholars used to interact with students. The most successful presentations engaged students in asking questions and were more than single guest lectures. The use of slides and other "hands-on" materials were generally successful. The least successful presentations were described as stiff lectures usually unrelated or only marginally related to the teachers' lessons or given at a level inappropriate for the students.

A few examples of successful scholar presentations include the following:

- A lecture on Shakespeare to two English classes to coincide with their attendance at a perfomance of Romeo and Juliet and their visit to a traveling exhibit from the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, D.C.
- Lectures on Dickens' Great Expectations as a document in the development of children's rights
- Readings of Macbeth as a film script
- A lecture for government classes (accompanied by slides of art and music) on the geographic, political and artistic components of the Renaissance and the effects of political patronage in the arts

- An introduction for cooking classes to cultures other than their own by instructing them in the preparation of ethnic dishes

- A joint lecture by two scholars on the religious revival in America in the 18th century, comparing it to contemporary society and explaining how insights of the historian can be used to understand aspects of our current social environment

(2) Independent Study

Independent research and special projects conducted by individual students were encouraged at only a few schools. Teachers agreed that such activities were very beneficial to students, but they were labor intensive for the scholar, and the class schedules of most students (except the gifted) left little or no room for such work. There were, however, several rather remarkable independent study projects undertaken, none of which--according to the teachers--would probably have happened without the scholar-in-residence.

In an independent study project, the student designs his or her own "contract" that describes the project, sets a date on which the project report will be complete, and requests a certain amount of credit. The report can take the form of a slide show, dramatic production, drawing or painting, audiotape, or the more conventional oral or written report. Scholars may generate student interest in independent study projects by holding formal office hours to meet with students, individually or in small groups.

Examples of successful independent study projects include the following:

- One student was interested in carrying out a project dealing with punishment in American history. He had seen a picture of a pillory, a common device for detaining criminals in colonial America and since he had experience in carpentry, he decided to build a pillory. The scholar-in-residence brought him a book with some illustrations of pillories taken from 17th century manuscripts, and they discussed library research and the places he might find the information he needed. The student gathered information about the kinds of crimes that were punished by a session in the stocks and proceeded to build a life-sized pillory, sanded and stained, with a hinged top to enclose a person's head and arms. The pillory was displayed in the Social Science Resource Center where students delighted in taking turns at temporary imprisonment. The student's teacher felt that this was the most positive educational experience of the student's high school career.

- "Whale Music." A student learned the scientific technique of translating whale songs into musical notation. He compared whale songs to rock music and explored the status of international efforts to balance the rights of whaling nations with concerns for endangered species.

- "Indians of the Mojave." A young man with a talent for nature photography spent a week visiting and photographing a

Mojave reservation, studying the environmental and historical inspiration for their art objects and observing how Indian art resembled the desert. He also studied Indian customs and how government has affected Indian culture.

- "Comparative Architecture of Schools and Prisons." A student studied the reasons for the similarity in design of schools and prisons, exploring issues in architecture, and theories of education, punishment and social responsibility.

Other notable projects undertaken in conjunction with social studies and literature classes have been drawings of American houses and bridges by a student who planned to study architecture, a model of the Boston Tea Party, a matchstick model of a Gold Rush town, an animated film on the Battle of Yorktown, and an illustrated guide to colonial American furniture.

Students created "newspapers" from the Civil War period, one from the North and one from the South; a "newspaper" written in Salem, MA in 1692, the year of the witch trials; and "diaries" written by a boy growing up in colonial Massachusetts and by soldiers in the Civil War.

One student who had never voluntarily read anything but magazines was pursuaded, as part of her independent study investigation of freedom, democracy and political refugees, to read all of Solzhenitsyn. Another, with the encouragement of the scholar, examined rock music and explored the idea that everything will be all right if we just "let it be."

Sometimes the "individual" study component was part of a larger group project. For example, students in a social studies course on the history, economy and society of the Pacific visited an Asian community where they were instructed to visit shops, religious centers, and other community sites. They were also asked to read a novel of the Asian culture, see a film, attend a concert, and interview members of the community. Where these assignments involved excursions, parents often went along. The students ultimately wrote a paper and made an oral presentation on the community and its place in California history.

(3) Teacher Inservice

Scholars held several informal meetings and discussions with teachers, but did not often atttempt to provide direct services to teachers as a group. One successful format for the semi-formal discussions was the "brown bag" lunch meeting in the school cafeteria. In this setting teachers and scholars discussed materials and methods of teaching, the latest book in a particular area, or the most recent scholarly articles on outcomes of educational research.

A more formal inservice program was the afternoon or evening seminar. These gatherings, usually held on Fridays, would bring together a scholar and a large group of teachers from one school, or several scholars and teachers from many schools. Though the manner of presentation varied, the discussions focused on recent publications and new trends in subject matter and teaching. For example,

teachers working with a scholar in English/American literature re-read and re-analyzed Moby Dick in the light of the latest methods of literary criticism or new materials on Melville. Or the seminars might bring together different departments: teachers from foreign languages, mathematics, and literature, for example, developed an integrated mini-course on Galileo, focusing on Galileo's work, Brecht's play Galileo, and pertinent movements in art and politics at the time.

An additional inservice benefit of the SIS program was the new and renewed use of university libraries and other facilities that the scholars' university connections provided. Several teachers, their appetites whetted by the contacts with scholars, enrolled in evening or summer session classes. Some even applied for grants or special stipends to do research on a project stimulated by the program. It was clear in the summary reports of the various SIS projects that developing the inservice component of the project--with and without input from the scholar--has considerable payoff in terms of teacher enrichment.

(4) Field Trips

The value placed on field trips varied from project to project. Some schools found the logistics too cumbersome. Although transportation could be a problem, the major difficulties concerned class schedules since a half or full day trip meant that certain students would miss classes taught by teachers on other subjects. Despite

Sometimes the "individual" study component was part of a larger group project. For example, students in a social studies course on the history, economy and society of the Pacific visited an Asian community where they were instructed to visit shops, religious centers, and other community sites. They were also asked to read a novel of the Asian culture, see a film, attend a concert, and interview members of the community. Where these assignments involved excursions, parents often went along. The students ultimately wrote a paper and made an oral presentation on the community and its place in California history.

(3) Teacher Inservice

Scholars held several informal meetings and discussions with teachers, but did not often atttempt to provide direct services to teachers as a group. One successful format for the semi-formal discussions was the "brown bag" lunch meeting in the school cafeteria. In this setting teachers and scholars discussed materials and methods of teaching, the latest book in a particular area, or the most recent scholarly articles on outcomes of educational research.

A more formal inservice program was the afternoon or evening seminar. These gatherings, usually held on Fridays, would bring together a scholar and a large group of teachers from one school, or several scholars and teachers from many schools. Though the manner of presentation varied, the discussions focused on recent publications and new trends in subject matter and teaching. For example,

teachers working with a scholar in English/American literature re-read and re-analyzed Moby Dick in the light of the latest methods of literary criticism or new materials on Melville. Or the seminars might bring together different departments: teachers from foreign languages, mathematics, and literature, for example, developed an integrated mini-course on Galileo, focusing on Galileo's work, Brecht's play Galileo, and pertinent movements in art and politics at the time.

An additional inservice benefit of the SIS program was the new and renewed use of university libraries and other facilities that the scholars' university connections provided. Several teachers, their appetites whetted by the contacts with scholars, enrolled in evening or summer session classes. Some even applied for grants or special stipends to do research on a project stimulated by the program. It was clear in the summary reports of the various SIS projects that developing the inservice component of the project--with and without input from the scholar--has considerable payoff in terms of teacher enrichment.

(4) Field Trips

The value placed on field trips varied from project to project. Some schools found the logistics too cumbersome. Although transportation could be a problem, the major difficulties concerned class schedules since a half or full day trip meant that certain students would miss classes taught by teachers on other subjects. Despite

the proximity of the urban schools to many field trip sites, many teachers felt strongly that most of the students would never have entered many of the museums, neighborhoods, universities, etc. on their own time.

In many cases, then, field trips were able to make use of local and regional resources to enrich the students' relationship with the local environment, its history and culture. The "ideal" field trip is planned and carried out by the scholar who is able to: (1) prepare the class for the trip, (2) conduct them through the exhibit or event in partnership with their teacher, and (3) hold follow-up sessions to help the students explore the significance of what they have seen.

The field trips undertaken by SIS projects included both large outings with busloads of students and mini-trips of a few carloads. One advantage of the mini-field trip of fewer than a dozen students is its modest cost. A large-scale trip involves considerable expense for buses, but a mini-trip can be handled through parents who will volunteer to drive a group in their private cars. It should be noted that districts may require parents' written permission for students to go on field trips, especially when traveling in private cars. Such rules should be looked into early in the planning stages.

Another advantage of the mini-field trip is the possibility of visiting smaller institutions such as the rare book room of a library, artists' studios, restaurants, map stores and specialized libraries.

Such places welcome small groups but cannot accommodate busloads of students at one time.

A few examples of successful SIS field trips include the following:

- Students visited the "Splendor of Dresden" exhibit at the Palace of the Legion of Honor in San Francisco. The exhibit contained a wealth of historical information captured in the rich artifacts of the time. Among the visitors were a few hundred vocational students, themselves craftsmen and future artisans. Both this exhibit and another, "Creativity: The Human Resource," at the California Academy of Sciences, showed technical vocations in an artistic and historic context. Teachers and students came away with a heightened awareness of the value of their talents.

  Before the trips to the "Dresden" exhibit, the resident scholar delivered a lecture on the historical background of the collection as well as of the art of collecting. Implications for the role of museums in society and for the display and value of art objects and artifacts was a major topic. Students were guided through the exhibit by museum docents and the scholar; they also viewed a film devoted to the collection and received materials to take home. The field trip of the "Dresden" event was integrated into the social studies, foreign languages, and vocational education curricula.

- Students participated in an "All-French Day," an "All-Italian Day" or an All-Asian Day" in San Francisco or Berkeley. The scholar prepared students for the excursion by exploring with them the historical and cultural antecedents of these cultures and how they came to develop communities within the city. Each "Day" included visits to schools, churches, newspapers, banks, cultural organizations, food and other specialty shops. The trips were designed to illustrate how various ethnic groups have flourished and maintained their own traditions in an urban environment, while remaining part of the larger American tradition.

- At the University of California at Berkeley, students saw a film made the previous year by teaching assistants and students in an introductory European History class. The actors in the film were college freshmen who had done research into their own family histories which they linked with their studies in European history. The high school students were able to experience some of the enthusiasm with which people just a few years older than they pursued some very interesting studies at Berkeley.

- Students attended a series of plays sponsored by the American Conservatory Theater in San Francisco. Before each performance the scholar-in-residence addressed the students in their theater seats, discussing the drama they were about to see. Back in their classrooms, the playgoers discussed their

experience, and the dramatic, cultural and historical significance of the play.

- Students on a trip to San Francisco's Mission District were given a tour of Mission Dolores by a Mexican-American with an extensive knowledge of California history and Roman Catholic tradition and symbolism. He gave a colorful tour of the church and cemetery. Since his "tourists" were Spanish language students, he used and carefully explained a number of Spanish words. The trip also included lunch at a local taqueria and a viewing of Mission District Murals.

- History classes studying the nature of the changing city in American history visited the Fort Point Museum, the Presidio Army Museum, the National Maritime Museum and Chinatown in San Francisco.

- Students of English literature went to the Renaissance Faire in Novato, the Shakespeare Garden in Golden Gate Park, and Shakespeare plays performed by the American Conservatory Theater.

- Economics classes travelled to the Federal Reserve Bank and to Housing and Urban Development projects. They heard lectures on banking and government financing which emphasized their historical, social and theoretical contexts.

Another valuable aspect of the field study trip is the possibility of making it a long-term addition to the regular curriculum. While preparing a class for a specific trip, for example, the scholar can make extensive notes or guides which a teacher can later use to prepare future classes for the same excursion. After a field trip, the scholar can summarize the experience gained, writing up a description of the significant features of the visited site, possible routes and options for transportation, names of contact people who can help in the future, and any special institutional or administrative considerations to keep in mind. The trip can thus be repeated with a minimum of effort.

(5) Special Events

Special festivals, fairs, exhibits, etc. have high visibility, and together with some of the field trips, were the kind of activity most often maintained after the SIS program formally ended. Administrators were especially supportive of these events.

Examples of successful special events for the school, the district, or the community include the following:

- Film festivals can be planned around a central theme with half a dozen or so films shown successively. The historical and cultural contexts of each film are studied in class prior to the showing; after the showing, students, and in some cases, parents and other members of the community, discuss the philosophical and other implications of the messages

delivered in the film. Inviting parents and community members to these special events helps link the educational sphere with the broader community.

- In one school district, bi-monthly evening seminars bring together a scholar and 15-20 parents to discuss a piece of literature, an historical event, or some other intellectual activity pertinent to what their children are studying in school.

- A special presentation of "Inherit the Wind," a play about a high school biology teacher who scandalized his community by teaching the theory of evolution, was given by students. They then disucssed the famous "Monkey Trial," both as a piece of judicial drama and as a landmark in judicial history.

c. Scholar Selection

The scholar must have an advanced degree, preferably a Ph.D., in one of the core disciplines of the humanities. He or she must be a good teacher, and very importantly, be free to devote sufficient time to the SIS project. It is preferable that the scholar not hold another part-time or university-related position.

In addition to doctoral candidates, scholars can be recruited from the ranks of university faculty who have retired or other tenured faculty with reduced university workloads; scholars affiliated with other institutions such as museums, archives, libraries, etc.; or independent and

professional scholars who work in a variety of business and government positions.

The steps involved in the recruitment and selection process include:

(1) Send announcements and application forms to all humanities departments at the colleges and universities in the area that offer graduate degrees in humanities disciplines.

(2) Prepare a prospectus for interested scholars that describes the program and its goals, the schools/districts likely to be involved, and the kind of work that the scholar could expect.

(3) Review the applications and resumes and prepare a list of preferred candidates to be interviewed.

(4) Interview the candidates at either the school or district office. If several schools are involved, the project coordinator may suggest that certain applicants be interviewed for certain schools. An alternative method used by one district was to invite all scholar-finalists to a social gathering where teachers could make a preliminary judgment as to which ones would be compatible with their schools and the subsequent interviews were held at the school sites so the scholars could get a sense of the working environment.

(5) Send a letter of appointment to the scholars selected for the positions and enclose a letter of agreement to be signed. Where more than one scholar was hired in a district, the project coordinator should make it clear that all will be working on the same pay scale.

Criteria for scholar selection will vary from site to site and will include several different personal and professional considerations. It is suggested, however, that primary emphasis be placed on how well scholars will be able to collaborate with teachers, enhance teachers' effectiveness in the classroom, and support the integration of scholarly input into the curriculum.

d. Teacher Preparation

Some orientation to the program will need to be given to school or district staff who have not been a part of the planning process. This will vary in scope from a simple "overview" meeting that describes the program and introduces the scholar(s) to a one-day seminar for teachers and other participants.

An outline of suggested activities for this seminar or workshop is given in the next section, "The Orientation Seminar." The meeting should be scheduled well in advance of the project start-up date, especially if that date is September of the new school year, so teachers will not be overwhelmed with other beginning-of-the-year concerns.

e. Program Evaluation Plan

As soon as possible in the planning process, try to determine what kind of reporting requirements will need to be met and what kind of ongoing project monitoring will be needed. Anticipate these monitoring and evaluation needs in the planning stage by considering the following questions:

• Who will receive the reports?	Funding agencies School/district administrators Other
• Who will write the reports?	Project Coordinator Scholar Outside evaluator Other
• When will they be written?	Quarterly After each event Other

• Will any data need to be gathered?	Pre and post tests Student evaluations Questionnaires
• Will any forms be needed?	Site reports Interviews Questionnaires

The Orientation Seminar

It is important that all SIS program participants attend the orientation seminar. This includes the planning team, any additional teachers or administrators participating in the program, the scholar(s) who have been selected, and anyone else involved in the implementation or evaluation of the program. You may also want to consider including--for all or some portion of the program--anyone who will not be directly involved in the program but has expressed interest in it (e.g., district or school administrators, parents, community members). Depending on the scope of your orientation seminar, you may also want to involve "visiting experts," that is, educators from other SIS programs who could offer input to both the overall shape of your program and the specific "nuts and bolts" of the operation.

The seminar outlined here will assume that all project participants are present and that there are several goals for the meeting:

(1) to inform anyone who has not been a part of the planning process of the project's goals and anticipated activities

(2) to solicit feedback on the proposed program from anyone not involved in the planning to date (Note: project planning materials can be distributed in advance if this will help the interaction)

(3) to introduce the scholar(s)

(4) to make further plans as needed with respect to specific activities, i.e., set dates, discuss appropriate materials, assign responsibilities, and perhaps most importantly, to coordinate with each other's schedules so that the best use can be made of the scholar's time and related curriculum activities can be planned to coincide with special events.

As with any meeting that has an ambitious agenda and a large group of participants, it is very important to watch out for potential hazards:

(1) Don't get bogged down in procedural details: if the small points of a specific activity cannot be resolved, move on. Don't waste the energy of the group on something that can be worked out later or resolved by the project coordinator.

(2) Keep the "process" on track: one of the most important things is for the project participants to interact openly with each other, but sometimes the discussion can get either too personal or too far afield of the current agenda as someone tries to insert his or her "pet concern" into the discussion.

At this critical point of the process--just when the results of the earlier planning need not only to be accepted but also to be transformed into the next level of action--it is important to get through the agenda, to keep moving forward. The skills of the project coordinator as group facilitator will be needed here.

It might be interesting to offer a "hands on" activity that will give teachers and administrators a better idea of the nature of the SIS project. This could be a "preview presentation" by the scholar, a small group curriculum planning activity for the teachers, a review of other successful SIS projects as a means of brainstorming possible activities, or something very practical that is needed by the group such as a plan for interdisciplinary activities, or a list of possible field sites and resources.

There will probably not be many opportunities for all program participants to meet together like this. The best use of this time will need to

be determined by the planning team with a view to maintaining a high level of enthusiasm among the staff for the project.

SIS Program Monitoring

The project team will determine the monitoring activities needed. The purpose of program monitoring is not only to ensure that the project's activities are well-conducted but also to provide input for any program evaluation that is required.

The project coordinator will perform informal monitoring tasks on an ongoing basis to see that the project is on schedule and that both classroom-based and field activities are carried out according to plan. Some kind of fiscal reporting may also be required.

Project monitoring is very closely tied to the requirements of program evaluation. The data collected during the course of the project are important input for the evaluation, e.g., teacher reports or student or audience questionnaires. If there is a non-staff evaluator and the project is a multi-site one, the project coordinator will need to work closely with the evaluator to ensure that the appropriate reporting takes place and that the evaluator has access to the materials or facilities that he or she needs.

The basic questions to be answered regarding program monitoring are:

WHO DOES IT?	Project Coordinator Program Evaluator School/District Administrator Other
WHEN IS IT DONE?	Ongoing Regular intervals Immediately after project events

HOW IS IT DONE? Reports
Interviews
Questionnaires
Other Forms

A good project plan will anticipate the monitoring needs and have a mechanism in place to meet them, keeping in mind that the details of the plan may change to accommodate a change in learning activities, availability of resources, or even staff turnover.

Regular meetings of the project coordinator, scholars, administrators, teachers, and outside advisors or consultants can be a source of strength to the project. If the project is a multi-year one, it is helpful to set aside a week or so prior to the second year for one or all of the following activities:

1. a two-day evaluation conference for district/school personnel and special consultants to evaluate the program and refresh everyone's understanding of its goals and objectives

2. a follow-up session to the evaluation conference that includes other superintendents, principals, college educators, humanities scholars and other key members of the educational community for the purposes of discussing the evaluation results, planning for the future and encouraging other schools/districts to adopt this kind of program

3. a workshop for all participating teachers, scholars, and administrators to produce plans for the next year's activities and refine or change project roles and responsibilities if needed

SIS Program Evaluation

The evaluation plan for the project may be formal or informal depending on the size of the project, number of sites, teachers and students, type of activities, and reporting requirements of the funding and/or administrative agency. Several evaluation questionnaires were developed during

the CCH-conducted SIS program. These are included in the Appendix of this Handbook.

One of the advantages of an outside evaluator is that he or she can monitor the working relationships between the scholar and teachers, or between the scholar(s) and the project coordinator. If work is not going well at the site, the project coordinator may not be providing the leadership needed by the project or the scholar may not be working out well with that particular constituency. It is important that replacements in personnel be made, if necessary, in a timely manner so that the program can proceed on schedule.

The CCH-sponsored projects found that the evaluation process itself can generate considerable resistance. It not only requires work outside of regular classroom activity but also makes teachers and administrators feel they are being judged. It is important to allay these fears as much as possible at the beginning, emphasizing the collaborative nature of the project and the goals which are shared by all. In addition, if the project participants help to design their own evaluation materials, it will help offset their feeling of being judged by others.

In order to get an overview of how effective the program has been in both quantitative and qualitative terms, a spreadsheet can be prepared at the end of the year. The spreadsheet includes both costs and evaluation data and can be used to assess the impact of the program and to guide future directions and budget decisions.

APPENDIX

SAMPLE EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS*

*The following sample evaluation instruments were used by the Humanists-in-the-Schools project, prior to the change in program title. References to Humanists-in-the-Schools and HIS should read Scholars-in-the-Schools and SIS.

CALIFORNIA COUNCIL FOR THE HUMANITIES

312 Sutter Street
Suite 601
San Francisco
CA 94108
415/391•1474

HUMANITIES

7/84

EVALUATION FORMS for END-OF-YEAR EVALUATION

TO: Humanists-in-the-Schools/Scholars-in-Residence Project Directors (In-District Coordinators)

FROM: Ann Pescatello, Special Projects Consultant

Enclosed please find several sets of items:

For Project Directors:

(1) General Sheet on Evaluation: H.I.S. Program
(2) Specific H.I.S. Points of Reference
(3) Description of Responsibilities in the Humanities Project
(4) General Humanists-in-the-Schools Goals
(5) Statistical Survey

For Parent/Community:

- Humanists-in-the-Schools Parent/Community Evaluation

For Students:

- Humanists-in-the-Schools Student Evaluations

For Administrators:

- Administrator's Evaluation

For Teachers:

(1) Description of Responsibilities in the Humanities Project
(2) Teacher's Form for Evaluating Visiting Humanists

For Visiting Scholar/Humanist:

(1) Description of Responsibilities in the Humanities Project
(2) Visiting Scholar's Form for Host Teacher Assessment and Activities

Project Directors should be responsible for all five forms under their category, and they should distribute the Parent/Community and Student forms as widely as possible. In the latter case, we expect to have a few hundred responses at least from each school. The more, the better. Project Directors should distribute and collect to and from Administrators, Teachers, and Visiting Scholars/Humanists one form per person for each person. I enclose copies from which sufficient copies can be reproduced. If you have any questions, feel free to call our office.

All materials should be returned to the CCH office by the end of the grant period.

PROJECT DIRECTOR

General Sheet on Evaluation: H.I.S. Program

We consider that we have five categories of concern or targets, as it were, in this program. We would like to see two things from you, in regard to the categories: one is samples of the "evaluation instrument" you use to gather data on the categories, and the second is some substantial data gathered.

I. STUDENTS. We are concerned with three things here, and would like concrete evidence on this category with as wide a sampling as possible.

1. Cognitive. What specific disciplinary knowledge or what specific knowledge of elements of the humanities have the students learned/acquired as a result, direct or indirect, of this program.

2. General Interest. What general knowledge of the humanities, of the so-called GREATER TRADITION, Western and/or non-Western, have the students acquired as a result of this program. I.e., 1. Do they have a general appreciation for what the humanities are; 2. Can they say that as a result of this program, they would have a greater interest in say, history, or language, or philosophy. Could you 3. find evidence that would indicate that, as a result of a scholar in one discipline, it has encouraged general achievement in other areas, honed general abilities in other areas.

3. Other areas. Could it be said that, for example, as a result of this program, 1. new courses have been developed which would become a part of the curriculum. 2. Any other areas in which students have been affected, in both the cognitive and affective domain?

II. TEACHERS. We are concerned with two things here, and this should also be as wide a sampling as possible, including, as with the students category, teachers who have been involved in other years, as well.

1. Improvement in classes. As a result of this program, has there been any improvement in styles of teaching, in course content, in ways of perceiving one's field, and any other tangibles.

2. Improvement of specific and general knowledge. As a result of this program, has the teacher's knowlege of content, of methods, etcetera, improved, been updated, or.....

3. Other considerations. development of teacher workshops, of brown-bag seminars, other routines that might become regular. Anything else?

III. COMMUNITY. This is an important category for us. We would like to have some data on broad involvement of parents and community, either as civic organizations or in whatever fashion. We would like specific events to have been planned to involve parents and community and for both sectors to be participants. How does the program reach the greater community.

IV. SCHOOL-COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY RELATIONSHIP. In this category we would like to learn of ties that have been established with universities, perhaps the home turf of the scholar. Also, we would like to know of plans whereby the school(s) will have had the scholar develop ties so that relationships will exist after the scholar has departed. This should be true, also, with museums, historical societies, libraries, etc.

V. LONG-TERM FOLLOW THROUGH. What are some of the ways in which we could have long-term follow throughs. I.e., such things as setting up permanent ties with colleges and other community organizations (item IV, above); new courses established; new patterns/modes of doing things, etc. Also, what permanent materials have been produced and can be utilized throughout the school, district, etc. In what other areas has the humanities training encouraged spin-offs. Other?

We would like to see samples of the types of evaluation "tools" or "instruments" you have designed to gather your information, including whatever "pre-testing" or "post-testing" you do.

In general, we are trying to find out two things: WHAT THINGS HAVE HAPPENED/ARE HAPPENING AS A RESULT OF THIS PROGRAM and

WHAT IS HAPPENING, PROGRAM-WISE AND OTHERWISE, THAT WOULD NOT HAVE HAPPENED WERE IT NOT FOR THIS PROGRAM.

We don't expect this to be an elaborate thing, and we don't want massive amounts of time spent on it. We do think that it will be valuable information to have to better plan the programs, and to help the participating districts have a more precise grip on what they would like to see happen.

PROJECT COORDINATOR

Specific HIS Points of Reference

Please answer the following questions as completely as possible.

1. Is the idea of a humanist in residence, i.e. a "scholar" with expertise in a particular discipline a viable concept for schools? If so, why; if not, why?

   Is the idea more viable for secondary than for elementary schools? Please be as specific as possible.

2. Can you indicate ways in which the project has been innovative in finding ways to involve teachers and students?

3. How has the HIS program been tied to the curriculum? i.e. how has it been integrated in ways that can continue past pilot funding?

4. How has the planning time been? Adequate? Insufficient? more than sufficient? What defects are there in planning and how important to the success of the program is the planning process?

5. Who should be involved in the planning?

6. Administrators:

   a. How important to the success of HIS is administration involvement?
   b. Who is/are the most important administrator(s) as regards the success of the program?
   c. What impediments have there been to the project by the school administration? Please be as candid as possible; your comments are confidential. What suggestions do you have for correcting any problematic situations?

7. Scholars:

   a. Is the scholar selection process a good one? What suggestions do you have for improving the process?
   b. Other than an advanced degree in a discipline of the humanities, what characteristics are most desireable for a scholar?
   c. Does the residency concept work best with a single scholar in a single school or with scholars rotating among schools in the district? If you believe that the process is more desireable to have a single scholar at a singl school or scholars at a school, how much other sharing do you think is important?
   d. Has the scholar grown as a result of this program?
   e. How effective is the scholar with students, in the classroom, as a parent and community liaison?
   f. Is scholar payment sufficient? What do you suggest?

8. Teachers:

   a. How are teachers selected to participate? Volunteers? Asked by the administration? Recruited by an interested party?
   b. Are teachers who participate committed to the program? Do they require monetary compensation? Are unions or teacher associations forces in the district? How do teachers view the scholar? What is the interaction between scholar(s) and teachers?
   c. Other? What is the degree and quality of teacher involvement in the program?
   d. Do you see this as a primary "enrichment" or deeper type program relating to humanities? How does this help in teaching courses.
   e. What do teachers understand to be the meaning of the humanities and the humanities discipline?

9. Funding:

   a. Is the funding adequate? If so, how so? If not, why not?
   b. Do you think that it is possible to be more creative with less funding?
   c. Other
   d. What do you think of the idea of challenge match funding? strengths and weaknesses.
   e. Given limited funding in this program, what prospects/strategies for funding would you suggest for keeping the program integral to the school.

10. Mechanics of the program:

   a. Do you like the concept of the program? Why?
   b. What are your assessments of setting up the program?
      1.What is your assessment of school selection process?
      2.Is it more important to have a proposal written by a teacher or teacher team, or by a curriculm specialist?
   c. Scholar recruitment procedures (please see item 7). Add anything else here.
   d. Planning. Please add anything from item 4 above.
   e. Program development:
      1. How much time is necessary to develop and to put into permanent place an HIS program?
      2. If funding were not renewable for three years, how would #1 above be accomplished?
      3. How realistic/important is the concept of total school-community involvement in such a process?
      4. Other comments?
   f. Parent and community involvement:
      1. What are the best and/or most realistic approaches to involving these groups in the program?
      2. Indicate other aspects of parent-community involvement you think would be desireable and appropriate for schools in general and HIS in particular.
   g. Other

11. University-school ties:

   a. What are the areas in which you have tried to create such a network?
   b. What difficulties are inherent in this relationship?
   c. How do you think that schools and universities can work together?
   d. What role do you see the scholar serving in this regard? If so, how?
   e. Do you see possibility of building onto your HIS experience to work with university? How?

12. Type and effectiveness of dissemination and promotional activities. While we all understand that the primary business of HIS is education, we are concerned to see that the community in general and parents in particular are aware of the interest that an organization such as ours takes in the improvement of education and enhancement of the humanities. Thus, it is important that this message is spread as widely and deeply as possible.

    a. what activities have you undertaken to accomplish the above?
    b. what activities do you recommend as the best vehicle for dissemination of the activities of the program specifically, and the promotion of the idea of the program generally?

13. What are the major features of this program that have occurred during the course of the program that would not otherwise have occurred in the school or district without the HIS program and the funding provided by the CCH? This is extremely important to know and we urge you to be as specific as possible.

14. What changes will have a lasting impact in education overall and in awareness of the humanities specifically within the school structure and will remain as a positive and permanent part of the school/district curriculum and program as a result of HIS. Please be as specific as possible.

15. In addition to the basic concept of the residency of a scholar for an intensive period in a discrete context, what other elements of improvement in humanities education would you suggest?

a. teacher workshops: when, for how long, with how many people, and under whose direction?
b. parent study groups: how conceived and constructed?
c. training sessions:
d. seminars for teachers: year-long, i.e. once a week during a school year? or for a four-six-eight week period during the summer?

1. would summer or year-long seminars for teachers be preferable to a scholar residency program? If so, why? If not, why?
2. what would you think of the combination of an HIS residency program plus seminars for teachers? Why?

e. summer institutes: of what type ? of what duration? how would these differ from workshops or seminars?

f. What other ideas do you have along these lines?

16. What have you done in your school/district with the Passport idea? What could you do with it?

17 Could you indicate here what dissemination activities you used to spread the news in your community about the project? Such avenues as radio, TV, newspaper coverage or special promotional activities should be noted. Also give an indication below of the numbers of people reached and the cost of each such activity.

	cost

PROJECT DIRECTOR (IN-DISTRICT COORDINATOR)

Description of Responsibilities in the Humanities Project

1. To process and account for all budgetary items: substitute days, field study trips, supplies, and all other expenditures.

2. To schedule interview meetings with principals, core teachers, and visiting humanists.

3. To attend and participate in all full day meetings, joint workshops, and individual teacher/humanists meetings in order to be aware and informed of all projects.

4. To act as facilitator in the scheduling of field trips, substitute days, and special projects, such as a humanities day or a community project.

5. To act as facilitator if differences occur between staff, humanist, or for general campus problems.

6. To schedule intra and inter-school meetings when necessary and appropriate.

7. To accompany visiting humanists and students on field study trips when appropriate.

8. To oversee and schedule evaluation procedures, as required by the funding agency.

9. To assist in curriculum development when appropriate.

10. To assume general responsibility for all elements of the HIS program in his/her particular district.

PROJECT COORDINATOR

General Humanist in the Schools Goals

Using a rating of 1 2 3 4 5 (with 5 being the highest and 1 the lowest, and 5 = excellent, 4 = very good, 3 = good, 2 = fair, and 1 = poor) please evaluate our general objectives.

I. How well has the HIS program at your school/in your district met the goals of

1. Encouraging an understanding of the value and meaning of the humanities for students who may or may not go to college _____

2. Demonstrating the place of the humanities as a basic part of pre-college education _____

3. Stimulating scholars trained in core disciplines of the humanities to make challenging presentations of their disciplines in non-university teaching situations _____

4. Providing an environment for fruitful interchange between scholars with special expertise in humanities disciplines and high school teachers and administrators _____

5. Exploring ways to develop innovative and experimental curricula for high schools, middle schools, and select elementary schools _____

6. Reaching out from the schools to involve community, local institutions, parents, and general citizens in participating in program activities _____

7. Affirming the relationship between studies of the humanities and the social, vocational, and civic lives of students and citizens _____

II. Please comment on any one or all of the seven categories noted above. Be brief, but give as much detail as possible.

	Direct	Indirect
13. Number of programs in which parents/community participated or attended----------	_____	_____
14. Number of days in the classroom----------	_____	_____

Activities involving teachers:

Type		
1. formal and informal seminars	_____	_____
2. lecture series	_____	_____
3. in-service	_____	_____
4. off-campus programs	_____	_____
5. other, please list		
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Activities involving students: # of. Please type or write in additional activities.

1. classroom presentations	_____	_____
2. Humanities Forums	_____	_____
3. Hours with the Scholars	_____	_____
4. Video Tape Resources	_____	_____
5. Einstein Week	_____	_____
6. Field Study Trips	_____	_____
7. Inter school activities (what kinds)	_____	_____
8. Intra school activities (what kinds)	_____	_____
9.	_____	_____
10.	_____	_____
11.	_____	_____
12.	_____	_____

STATISTICAL SURVEY

	Numbers Involved	
	Direct	Indirect
1. Number of schools participating----------	_____	_____
a. general school participation number---	_____	_____
b. schools directly involved----------		
2. Number of classes participating----------	_____	_____
	_____	_____
3. Different departments participating--------	_____	_____
4. Overall number of students participating---	_____	_____
a. overall number of students with direct participation----------	_____	_____
b. overall number of students involved in general----------	_____	_____
5. Approximate number of students( ) ( ) and other schools( ) who participated in the program.	_____	_____
6. Number of teachers participating in the (in-service) programs (itemize programs and number of teachers involved)----------	_____	_____
7. Number of classes participating in field study trips----------	_____	_____
8. Number of students participating in one or more field study trips* ----------	_____	_____
9. Number of students participating in the program activities----------	_____	_____

(Please itemize each activity as well) (use separate sheet--see over)

10. Number of s cholar presentations given-----	_____	_____
a. in the classroom----------	_____	_____
b. elsewhere----------	_____	_____
11. Number of school days the scholars devoted to the satellite program----------	_____	_____
12. Number of parents and community involved---	_____	_____

* Please indicate here whether these are the same classes, repeats, or multiple classes.

PARENT/COMMUNITY

Humanist-in-the-Schools Parent/Community Evaluation

Your child/children have been in a school that has hosted a Humanist-in-the-School(scholar residency in the humanities) program. Could you take a few minutes to evaluate the program or aspects of the program with which you are familiar.

Using a rating of 1 2 3 4 5 (with 5 being the highest and 1 the lowest, and 5 = excellent, 4 = very good, 3 = good, 2= fair, and 1 = poor) please evaluate our general objectives.

1. I rate this program_____

2. What was most valuable in this program? (please list):_____

_____

3. What was least valuable in this program was_____

_____

4. I learned MUCH SOME LITTLE NOTHING from the program(s) I attended or in which I was involved.

5. Should we have more programs of this type? YES NO (circle one).

6. What suggestions do you have for improving future humanities programs.

_____

_____

7. Comments:_____

_____

_____

8. I am representing: Community___ Parent_____ School_____ Volunteer_____ Other_____

9. My name is_____

10. I am interested in receiving further information about the Humanist-in-the-Schools Program and the California Council for the Humanities, and in participating in/attending future HIS programs.

NAME_____

ADRESS_____

SCHOOL/ORGANIZATION_____

PHONE_____

HUMANIST-IN-THE-SCHOOLS

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

Name_____ Teacher's Name_____

Class_____ School _____

Sex _____ M
_____ F

Age _____

This is an important evaluation form. It helps us evaluate the experimental program, Humanists-in-the-Schools, which has been operating in your school. Please give as complete answers as possible. Your help is appreciated.

Please check the activities in the Humanists-in-the-Schools/Scholars-in-Residence program in which you have participated:

Independent Study Projects _____
Student Advocate Projects _____
Museum and/or Library trips:
Please list them_____
_____
_____

Special class/group projects_____
Films/Film Festival_____
Other Field trips:_____
_____
_____
_____

Other features of the program, please list:_____
_____
_____
_____

1. For each of the activities in which you participated, please write a sentence or two that tells us the value to you of such an activity.

2. Of the activities in which you participated, rank them according to which were the most value to you as an educational activity. Tell us why for each?

3. Please discuss your participation in the above program and activities. What value did it have for you? What value could it have for you?

4. How do you feel you have changed, how do you think your life and you school work have been changed or improved by your experience in this program?

5. Please evaluate the visiting humanist/scholar in your school. How effective was (s)he? Please be as specific as possible.

6. What other special activities/features would you wish to see added to the progr

7. What suggestions for additions, deletions, or changes in the program would you wish to make in future years?

8. Any other comments of a constructive nature that you would care to make would be greatly appreciated. Thank you.

9. If you could choose any subject to study on your own, what would you like to study most?

   Subject:

   Why? (several sentences)

10. Give your own definition of the humanities. Begin: "Humanities is the study of..." (several sentences)

11. If you could live with a family outside of the United States for a brief time in order to understand a different culture, where would you choose to go and why?

    a. Name a different culture.

    b. Why? (several sentences)

12. Have you changed your view of another culture because of the humanities program?

    Yes No (circle one)

    Why? (several sentences)

13. If you could live your life in another time, in the past or future, what time would you choose and why?

    Another time: date?

    Why? (several sentences)

14. What did you experience in the humanities program that seemed totally new? Describe? (several sentences)

15. Did the humanities program help make the class you were enrolled in more interesting than you expected?

    Yes No (circle one)

    Why? (several sentences)

16. If you could participate in this humanities program next year, what would you like to do in it?

    Describe: "I would like to..." (several sentences)

17. As a result of your participation in this project, what activities that you began here, have you continued outside of your school?

HUMANISTS-IN-THE-SCHOOLS EVALUATION

Administrator's Evaluation

We would appreciate it if you could take a bit of time from your busy schedule to help us evaluate the Humanists-in-the-Schools Project.

1. What specific expectations did you have when your school agreed to be involved in the Project? How well were they met?

2. Evaluate the overall performance of your Visiting Humanist in helping to develop the humanities in your school.

3. Did the Visiting Humanist work well with the teachers on the humanities team?

4. Did the Visiting Humanist work well with counselors and/or administrators?

5. Did you or another administrator make an effort to have the Visiting Humanist utilized as a resource person for teachers besides the humanities team? If so, with what results? If not, why not?

6. Are you continuing your participation in the humanities program next year?

7. Do you have any specific plans, long-range or immediate, to develop this project at other levels?

8. Did you receive sufficient visits and communications (either directly or through the Visiting Humanist) from the Project Coordinator?

9. What suggestions would you make for the Project to improve or otherwise change or become more effective next year?

10. Please comment on anything of concern to you which has not been covered above.

Thank you very much for your help in this Project.

_____ _____ _____

(Date) (Signature) (Title and School)

TEACHERS

Description of Responsibilities in the Humanities Project

1. To set up assignment calendars for each month with the visiting humanists and provide copies for teachers, humanists, and the project director.

2. To notify project director of the following:

   a. special events with the humanists

   b. field study trip dates in order to provide combined scheduling

   c. substitute days

   d. supplies

3. To act as liaison between humanists and other teachers for scheduling additional events: lectures, field trips, curriculum development, and materials.

4. To participate in evaluation procedures.

5. To agree to meet periodically after school with the project director or key participants, as the need arises.

6. To explain the general school rules to the humanist regarding students' behavior and procedures.

TEACHER

Host Teacher's Name_____ School's Name_____

I. The Visiting Humanist

Using a rating of 1 2 3 4 5 (with 5 being the highest and 1 the lowest, and 5 = excellent, 4 = very good, 3 = good, 2 = fair, and 1 = poor), please check the appropriate blank which best describes:

The Visiting Humanist's

1. contribution to the development of our humanities Project _____
2. ability to establish a good working rapport with his(her) host colleagues _____
3. ability to establish a good rapport with students _____
4. assistance in working with the administration for the humanities Project _____
5. competency in course content _____
6. competency in methods for teaching materials taught _____
7. functioning in the planning sessions as a coordinator of the various disciplines and the methodologies of those disciplines _____
8. ability to adapt his(her) capabilities to your school's needs _____

To questions 9 and 10, give as complete answers as possible; write on the back of this sheet if you need more space.

9. List several qualities you think are essential in a Visiting Teacher and indicate to what degree your Visiting Humanist possessed them.

10. Indicate any changes in teaching strategies or materials that you have acquired as a result of your interaction with the visiting humanist(s). Give some examples, if possible.

II. The Personal Professional Experience

Check the blank in front of the word or phrase which allows each statement to reflect best your assessment of the issue. Where necessary, please elaborate on the back of this sheet.

1. I ___volunteered ___was asked and willingly agreed ___accepted hesitatingly the assignment to participate in the new humanities program.
2. This ___was ___was not my first time ever on a teaching team.
3. The team experience was ___a great help ___of no significant effect ___detrimental to my growth as a humanities teacher.
4. My attitude about humanities content and method in the classroom ___became more positive ___remained unchanged ___became more negative through working in the humanities project.
5. I would_____ would not_____ participate in the humanities project again.
6. I would prefer to teach humanities now ___ on a team____alone____both ____neither.
7. In a year or two, I ___would like ___would not like to try teaching an interdisciplinary course in another content area.
8. At this time, I ___have ___do not have concrete plans to do further preparatory work in content of the humanities, either through graduate courses or independent study.
9. My teaching in my other classes has been affected by my working in the humanities project ___in important ways ___somewhat ___not at all.

Please elaborate with specific examples.

a.

b.

c.

d.

e.

f.

g.

10. In general, I ___thought ___did not think the humanities project was a meaningful and challenging part of the students' studies this past year. Please explain.

IV. General Questions

Please respond as completely as possible to the following on a separate sheet of paper.

1. Describe your attitude toward working in such a humanities venture prior to and after the HIS/SIR project.

2. Indicate generally how the experience of this past year has influenced you as a teacher, both in the humanities project and in your other classes.

3. Describe briefly your expectations of the Humanities Project year before it began and comment on how your experiences during the year compare to those expectations.

4. Offer any suggestions or advice you feel it would be good to convey to other teachers about to start a new Project year.

5. Comment on anything about your experience in the Humanities Project which has not yet been covered, or not covered thoroughly enough.

6. With the Project behind you, define "humanities" in its pedagogical context in the secondary school; in other words, what has it come to mean to you as a teacher?

7. Do you think your students now have a better understanding of the "humanities" than they did before? Is this measureable? If so, how?

_____ _____

(Date) (Signature)

III. The School Environment and the School District staff.
Check the blank in front of the word or phrase which allows each statement to reflect best your assessment of the issue. Where necessary, please elaborate on the back of the sheet.

1. I feel that the school administration ___was ___was not fully committed to the Humanities Project in its school.
2. I feel that the school district administration ___was ___was not fully committed to the Humanities Project in our school.
3. I ___was ___was not able to teach comfortably and effectively with my fellow team teachers.
4. I ___was ___was not satisfied with the level of intelligence and motivation of the students who were in the humanities program.
5. Non-humanities teachers in the school ___seemed interested in a positive way ___indifferent to our new humanities program.
6. The administration ___showed a continuing interest in ___seemed indifferent to our humanities program.
7. Financial support for the course was ___ample ___barely sufficient ___inadequate.
8. Other teachers from the school ___were ___were not involved now and then in our humanities projects. (Give specific examples if "yes," explain reasons if "no.")

9. In general, I thought the school staff ___did ___did not adequately aid our efforts in developing our new program.
10. Visits and communications (either directly or through the Visiting Humanist) were ___frequent enough ___too infrequent ___ too frequent.
11. The planning sessions as set up were ___very helpful ___okay ___disappointing.
12. The anonymous and confidential student evaluations administered for the project ___were ___were not adequate and acceptable to me.
13. Give some positive suggestions for greater support by the district staff (either things to continue doing or new things to do), both for new Project schools and for you next year.

VISITING HUMANISTS

Description of Responsibilities in the Humanities Project

1. To meet with staff, students, and community on the specified days as agreed upon at workshops and planning meetings.

2. To accompany students on all planned field study trips.

3. To act as liaison between the personnel at school sites and the community.

4. To provide instruction and a variety of other educational resources for students at the agreed upon schedule.

5. To provide school-wide inservice seminars for the total staff when dates are established at school sites.

6. To understand and comply with general school rules regarding high school students, i.e to work within the framework of a particular school structure.

7. To work cooperatively with teachers and administrators in a team effort.

8. To investigate content areas beyond the narrow definition of a particular discipline.

9. To take an initiating role in teaching and HIS-project activities.

10. To act as liaison between the personnel at school sites and intellectual and cultural institutions in reasonable proximity to the school site(s).

VISITING SCHOLAR

Visiting Scholar's Name _____ School's Name _____

Using a rating of 1 2 3 4 5 (with 5 being the highest and 1 the lowest, and 5 = excellent, 4 = very good, 3 = good, 2 = fair, and 1 = poor) please evaluate our general objectives. (Fill in the last names of the four teachers on the team).

I. Host Teachers: _____ _____ _____ _____

The teacher's

1. command of material in his/her discipline _____ _____ _____ _____
2. general ability in the classroom as a teacher _____ _____ _____ _____
3. openness to new content _____ _____ _____ _____
4. openness to new methods _____ _____ _____ _____
5. rapport with students _____ _____ _____ _____
6. rapport with fellow teachers in the classroom _____ _____ _____ _____
7. ability as a team planner _____ _____ _____ _____
8. quality of ideas suggested in plan ing sessions _____ _____ _____ _____
9. willingness to work extra to develop a new course _____ _____ _____ _____
10. general contribution to the development of a new program _____ _____ _____ _____
11. growth as a teacher in the humanities _____ _____ _____ _____
12. commitment to further development and teaching of subject area or of interdisciplinary humanities _____ _____ _____ _____

II. General Atmosphere of the School

Check the blank in front of the word or phrase which allows each statement to reflect best your assessment of the issue. Where necessary, please elaborate.

1. The school's administration___was ___was not supportive of the humanities project.

2. The school district's administration___was ___was not supportive of the humanities project.

3. The financial support for the project was___ample ___barely sufficient ___inadequate.

4. The level of students in the class was___conducive ___of no consequence ____detrimental to developing a good humanities program.

5. The general atmosphere of the school was___conducive ___of no consequence ___detrimental to developing a good humanities program.

6. The attitudes toward humanities of team faculty members not on the teaching team were ___positive ___indifferent ___negative.

7. The chances that the program or aspects of the program will continue and succeed in the next few years are ___good ___50-50 ___poor. Why?

8. The chances that the program and its teachers will exert an influence in the next few years in the school and/or district for introducing an interdisciplinary humanities approach in other classes are ___good ___50-50 ___poor. Why?

III. The Project Director

This section has items in different formats. Respond appropriately to the format of the individual item, and where necessary, please elaborate.

1. The administrative support of the Project Director to you was ___satisfactory ___unsatisfactory ___in-between.

2. Communication to you from the PD was ___about the right amount ___too infrequent ___too frequent.

3. The team teachers and administrators thought the PD's support of them was ___satisfactory ___insufficient ___excellent.

4. List ways in which the PD and school district administrators could and/or should improve its support of the Visiting Teachers and their schools during the school year.

IV. General Questions

Please answer the following questions as completely as possible.(Use other paper)

1. What did you gain from your experience this year?

2. What were the main difficulties to be overcome (and whether they were or not) in setting up the humanities program in your school?

3. Summarize briefly the accomplishments at your school and your contribution to them under the Project.

4. Reread the Project and comment on the accomplishments at your school in light of the goals of the Project as implied or stated in the brochure.

5. List and describe each time you were used as a guest presenter or a resource consultant in classes other than the regular classes of the teacher teams. Include also informal relationships you may have made with other teachers (outside the humanities team) through which an interdisciplinary humanities approach to teaching may have been fostered.

6. Please comment on any matters of import to you which have not been covered, or covered insufficiently, above.

7. Could you describe the wider impact of the program beyond the school on parents and general community. Please explain in some detail.

8. How closely did you/could you collaborate with your fellow visiting humanists and what recommendations would you make for the future?

_____ _____

(Date) (Signature)